DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 324 EC 102 372

AUTHOR	Weckler, Elaine, Comp.
TITLE	IMPACT: Instructional Model Program for All Children and Teachers. Annual Evaluation Report, 1975-1976.
INSTITUTION	Berrien Springs Public Schools, Mich.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	98p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal reproducibility of original
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Annual Reports; *Demonstration Projects; Diagnostic Teaching; Elementary Education; *Handicapped Children; Information Dissemination; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Evaluation; *Regular Class Placement; Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*Project IMPACT

ABSTRACT

Presented is the annual evaluation report on the Instructional Model Program for All Children and Teachers (IMPACT), a project for training both regular classroom teachers and special education teachers of students in grades k through 8 to alter the educational environment, thus enabling many handicapped children to be served as they are mainstreamed into the classroom. Described in the first section are the project's educational philosophy, context, and activities. Section II contains answers to project evaluation questions and statistical data on attainment of product objectives (including the further dissemination of Project IMPACT). It is noted in a third section that the IMPACT diagnostic/prescriptive system can be implemented in a variety of educational settings; that IMPACT workshop materials are structured to provide ease in implementing the workshops yet are flexible enough to be used with the existing curriculum; and that the Commitment Criteria established by the IMPACT staff was met. The remainder of the document consists of appendixes which include IMPACT materials used to document student change, teacher change, and program adoptions. (SBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED144324

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

1975-1976

IMPACT

Instructional Model Program for All Children and Teachers

compiled by
Elaine Weckler, Project Director
Berrien County Intermediate School District
with Evaluation Results by
Dr. Uldis Smidchens, Project Evaluator
R.E.D.E. Center
Research Evaluation Development & Experimentation
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Elaine Weckler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EC 103782

Table of Contents
for
Annual Evaluation Report

I. Narrative

A. Description of Project
B. Context of Project
C. Project Activities

II. Evaluation

A. Answers to Evaluation Questions
B. Attainment of Product Objectives

III. Judgments of Worth

A. Value of Outcomes

IV. Appendices

A. Data Gathering Instruments

I

Narrative

by
Elaine Weckler
IMPACT Project Director

I. Narrative

A. Description of the project.

1. Educational Philosophy of project.

The IMPACT project (Instructional Model Program for All Children and Teachers) has completed five years as an E.S.E.A. Title III project. During the first three years, project staff, demonstration classroom teachers and workshop participants, tried and evaluated methods, techniques and materials that were effective in meeting the needs of children with specific learning problems and in developing an inservice package to share the diagnostic/prescriptive teaching system with other educators.

The fourth year project staff worked on the goals of replicability and exportability. The same results for both student and teacher gains were achieved in 1974-75 as the project was replicated in the Grand Haven Public Schools as were recorded in 1973-74.

Serving as a demonstration site for the Michigan Department of Education Adoption Program, the IMPACT project staff has identified and trained staff from nine school districts.

Education's alternative for many children with learning and/or behavior problems in the past has been failure, full or partial placement in a special education facility or social promotion. IMPACT training provides teachers with a system for altering the educational environment, thus enabling many handicapped children who previously may have been placed in self-contained special education classrooms to be served as they are mainstreamed into the general purpose classroom. The IMPACT workshop

training develops an awareness and provides skills for better defining the students' observable behaviors so that referrals are better prepared when additional services are needed. The IMPACT training provides special education teachers with a variety of options to effectively mainstream students and to assist fellow teachers in finding a performance level of success both in the special education class and in the regular classroom. IMPACT training also provides to special education personnel, a consultant model with proven techniques in diagnostic/prescriptive procedures which allow them to particularly meet the needs of three types of students; the child with the learning disorder/disability (L.D.), the child with limited intellectual potential (EMI), and the child with emotional behavior adjustment problems (EI).

Key components of the IMPACT program are; the teacher training workshop, the IMPACT Box, the consultation program and demonstration classrooms.

The IMPACT Box has been the nucleus for the workshop series since its development during the first year. The format of the IMPACT Box is a desktop unit with 500 convenient 5 x 8 cards, organized to systematically lead the teachers through an assessment of strenghts and weaknesses in the areas of academic skills, behavior and learning process patterns. Following assessment, a variety of skill oriented activities are available to allow the teacher to select those options best suited to the teaching and learning styles of the teacher and students for their specific learning environment.

The IMPACT staff has twice revised the IMPACT Box and in 1974, the

Berrien County Intermediate School District signed a contract with Academic Therapy Publications of San Rafael, California to commercially publish and market the IMPACT Box.

Workshop materials accompanying the IMPACT Box are written in a modular format consisting of a behavioral objective, materials needed, content, delivery and evaluation. Manuals have been published for both workshop participants and IMPACT instructors. The workshop training series consists of five days and follows the organization of the IMPACT Box. The sessions are;

Session I	Classroom Organization and Twelve Principles of a Success-Oriented Curriculum.
Session II	Assessment of Academic Skills and Behavior Problems.
Session III	Prescription for Academic Skills and Behavior Problems.
Session IV	Assessment of Learning Process Deficits Relating to Developmental Lag or Learning Disabilities.
Session V	Prescription for Remediation and/or Accommodation of Learning Process Deficits.

The five sessions, when spread over the course of the school year, and when accompanied by field visits of the IMPACT Consultant, have proved to be the most effective way of achieving teacher change, which in turn leads to learning success for the students.

The IMPACT staff and visiting teachers have voiced the opinion that it is essential for participants to see a demonstration class where teachers implement the IMPACT success-oriented curriculum in a school situation. This demonstration model gives a visual perspective from which to relate. The role of the IMPACT participating teacher then is to prepare a rich

learning environment herself before the child enters the room. After that, the teacher becomes a discreet diagnostician noting specific strengths and weaknesses of each child and guiding him through the appropriate materials through small group instruction incorporating learning centers.

B. Context of Project.

1. The IMPACT Project in Berrien County.

Twelve demonstration classrooms are maintained in constituent districts of the Berrien County Intermediate School Dsitrict. These rooms are located in Benton Harbor, St. Joseph, Bridgman, Coloma, Lakeshore, and Niles school districts. Teachers in these classrooms have been schooled in the IMPACT system. They demonstrate either the dominant or transitional use of learning centers as a method of classroom organization. Each of the demonstration center teachers followed the complete diagnostic/ prescriptive programming package outlined in the IMPACT Box, including writing of programs for a minimum of two special education children. The demonstration classrooms represent varying cultural and socio-economic backgrounds as well as differing grade levels.

Teachers, while enrolled in the IMPACT workshop, visit the demonstration classrooms where they can see at first hand, the IMPACT success-oriented curriculum being implemented. A question and answer time is also provided during these visits for demonstration teachers to share ideas with workshop trainees.

Throughout Berrien County, local school districts provide release time

and IMPACT materials for their teacher participants in IMPACT workshops. The Berrien County Intermediate School District provided consultants to conduct the IMPACT workshops and to meet with the teachers on a regular basis. Each teacher selected a minimum of two children having learning or behavior problems to assess and write a prescriptive program using the IMPACT system. Teachers met with IMPACT consultants on a monthly basis to record and/or revise the individual program of students and to discuss classroom and management techniques.

2. The IMPACT Project in Michigan.

As a followup to the Adoption Package mailing by the Michigan Department of Education to all Superintendents, IMPACT staff mailed awareness level fliers. This flier, featuring a returnable card whereby additional requests could be made, went to all Superintendents of Intermediate School Districts, Superintendents of public and parochial school districts, curriculum directors, and directors of Special Education programs in Michigan. Using the returnable card administrators of school districts requested abstracts, loan of the promotional filmstrip, "IMPACT - Did Today Matter?", arranged for on site visits, made phone calls and reviewed evaluation reports and program costs.

IMPACT staff were selective as to conference and/or convention participations choosing only those meetings where decision makers in the area of the project interest would most likely be in attendance.

The NASCD, National Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development was selected for project participation because the majority of the conference

attendees are decision makers and are interested in inservice for teachers.

The International Reading Association Conference was selected for project participation for the following reasons;

1. The great size of IRA, and its mailings to members provided the IMPACT project with a great amount of free dissemination.
2. Attendance at the conference brings in many instructors from colleges and universities.
3. The IRA is also interested in information on remediating reading/language/learning disorders.
4. Many IRA members are involved with staff workshops/inservice in their districts.

As dissemination activities created interest in project IMPACT the procedures of the Michigan Adoption Program were followed.

School districts interested in project IMPACT submitted Letters of Interest to the Michigan Department of Education. The department forwarded these letters to the demonstration site. Project staff met administrators from districts interested in adopting the project and conducted Knowledge and Decision level meetings. These meetings consisted of on site visits to demonstration classrooms, review of IMPACT materials, discussion of IMPACT's committment criteria, the Statement of Assurance as well as project implementation and planning for staff training.

C. Project Activities.

1. Workshop Delivery System.

The IMPACT demonstration site team has provided the same workshop format and materials to all of the school districts adopting project IMPACT during a five day period at Berrien Springs, Michigan.

Using materials of the IMPACT Kit, the IMPACT demonstration site staff train members of adopting districts in the use of the IMPACT system using filmstrips, visits to demonstration classrooms, role playing, small group consultant sessions, brain storming sessions and game activities.

Classrcom Organization focuses on twelve learning principles considered consistent with the success-oriented curriculum. The development of a classroom organized around the learning center concept is an integral part of Session I. Teachers observe classrooms organized in such a fashion by visiting some of the demonstration classrooms located throughout Berrien County. These classrooms were selected for demonstration purposes because of their exemplary use of a success-oriented curriculum characterized by individualized programs for children with special learning problems. The workshop participants also converse with the demonstration teachers and review first hand their concerns about implementing the ideas to which they are exposed.

The first phase of the diagnostic/prescriptive procedures are embarked upon in Session II, Assessment of Academic Skill and Behavior. This system requires that teachers first assess academic skills (reading auditory, reading visual, other reading skills, language, mathematics, fine and gross motor) and behavior. The assessment of these skills and

of behavior is accomplished through a series of informal checklists and inventories, results of which are recorded on an assessment profile. Teachers are instructed in the use of these assessment tools at the second workshop session. At the third workshop the emphasis turns to programming in the area of academic skills and behavior. Session III centers on writing behavioral objectives and designing a program suitable for reading instructional objectives. Teachers are familiarized with programming ideas, ranging from commercial materials, teacher-made materials, and teaching activities, to classroom management techniques. The objectives and programs are recorded on program forms, the primary means for systematizing the individualized programs for selected children.

The focus of the fourth workshop session is on assessment of learning processes. These are the pre-cognitive or perceptual processes in the expressive modalities which underlie the effective learning of academic skills. Again workshop participants are familiarized with informal inventories, teachers are familiarized with symptomatologies of deficit processes and expressive modalities as well as task analysis.

The focus of the last workshop is on programming for children with identified learning process problems. Commercial materials, teacher-made materials and learning activities relevant to stated instructional objectives are reviewed. In Session V, ways of accommodating or making life easier for a child with these problems are also explored since remediation of many of these problems is slow, difficult, and in some cases impossible.

Because of the time, travel and cost factors involved in the training of staff of adopting districts, the five day sessions are held all within one week. Trainees are instructed that maximum benefits will be achieved when the five days are spread over the course of a normal school year with the local IMPACT consultant visiting teachers to assist in classroom organization, behavior management and to make revisions or record progress on the IMPACT program forms. Planning a suitable timeline for program implementation is achieved during this on site training session.

2. Adoptions of Project IMPACT.

IMPACT project activities main focus was on the goal of training staff of adopting districts in the implementation of the IMPACT diagnostic/ prescriptive system.

Selected staff of Detroit Region V Public Schools were trained in a joint workshop session with members of the Avondale Public Schools on September 29 to October 3, 1975.

Detroit Region V IMPACT L.E.A. used the first semester of the 75-76 school year to organize demonstration classrooms and to create an awareness of IMPACT to other teachers. Workshop sessions were held on January 27, 1976, April 1, April 13, May 19 and June 3 using IMPACT materials. The Detroit IMPACT team of 8, trained a pilot group of 15 volunteer teachers. Detroit IMPACT LEA plans to train an additional group of 10 volunteers during the 1976-77 school year.

The Avondale Public Schools LEA trained all members of their K - 8 staff

in the IMPACT system using IMPACT LEA teachers as demonstration teachers and workshop consultants.

IMPACT staff trained a team from Birmingham Public Schools on January 19 - 23, 1976. The Birmingham plan of implementation was to establish demonstration classrooms and implement the diagnostic system in classrooms of the IMPACT LEA team with workshops to be held in the 1976-77 school year for a limited number of volunteers.

Six adoptions were made together as a direct result of a workshop presentation made by IMPACT staff to the Upper Peninsula Educational Fair in Escanaba on November 3, 1975. Upper Peninsula districts of Delta Schoolcraft Intermediate School District, Escanaba Public Schools, Gladstone, Bark River, Rock and Big Bay de Noc, sent staff to be trained at the IMPACT site on April 26 - 30, 1976.

Similar implementation plans exist with the five school districts with the Delta Schoolcraft ISD varying because they provide services to districts. The five school districts plan to organize and implement the IMPACT system in LEA IMPACT staff classrooms during the fall of the 76-77 school year with a workshop training program to begin the second semester.

The IMPACT demonstration site staff provides technical assistance to adopting districts by phone consultations and on site visits. On site visits have been made to Avondale, Detroit Region V and Birmingham schools. Visits have been made to workshop sessions, LEA IMPACT Coordinators, demonstration classrooms as well as total LEA IMPACT staffs.

II

Evaluation

Compiled by IMPACT Staff
with Evaluations by
Dr. Uldis Smidchens of R.E.D.E.
Center and Student data
reported by Dr. Paula Dent
Achievement Specialist Detroit
Region V Schools

RE-4499
4/76

Michigan Department of Education
Research, Evaluation and Assessment Services
TITLE III (IV-C) EVALUATION
Box 420, Lansing, Michigan 48902

ESEA TITLE III (IV-C) ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

EDUCATIONAL AGENCY	Legal Name of School District	District Code No.	Telephone – Area Code/Local No.
	Berrien County Intermediate School District	11000	(616) 471-7725
	Address: 711 St. Joseph Avenue	City: Berrien Springs, Michigan	Zip Code: 49103

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: This form should be completed by all Title III (IV-C) projects classified as developmental, experimental or demonstration.

MAILING INSTRUCTIONS: Return ONE copy of this form by AUGUST 16, 1976 to the STATE address indicated above. Retain ONE copy for your file.

NOTE: If you have questions regarding this form, please contact Robert Carr at the above address or at (517) 373-1830.

PROJECT CLASSIFICATION:
(Check ONE only)
- ☐ Developmental
- ☐ Experimental
- ☒ Demonstration

1. Project Title: IMPACT - Instructional Model Program for All Children and Teachers.

2. Which of the Common Goals of Michigan are addressed by your project?
(Check ALL that are MAJOR focuses (i.e., goals) of your project.)

GOAL AREA I: CITIZENSHIP AND MORALITY
- ☐ 1. Morality
- ☐ 2. Citizenship and social responsibility
- ☐ 3. Rights and responsibilities of students

GOAL AREA II: DEMOCRACY AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
- ☐ 1. Equality of educational opportunity
- ☐ 2. Education of the non-English speaking person
- ☒ 3. Education of the exceptional person
- ☐ 4. Allocation of financial resources
- ☐ 5. Parental participation
- ☐ 6. Community participation

GOAL AREA III: STUDENT LEARNING
- ☒ 1. Basic skills
- ☐ 2. Preparation for a changing society
- ☐ 3. Career preparation
- ☐ 4. Creative, constructive, and critical thinking
- ☐ 5. Sciences, arts and humanities
- ☐ 6. Physical and mental well-being
- ☐ 7. Self-worth
- ☐ 8. Social skills and understanding
- ☐ 9. Occupational skills
- ☐ 10. Preparation for family life
- ☐ 11. Environmental quality
- ☐ 12. Economic understanding
- ☐ 13. Continuing education

APPENDIX: EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT
- ☒ 1. Quality teaching
- ☒ 2. Accountability
- ☐ 3. Assessment and evaluation
- ☐ 4. Research and development

3. How many staff members paid from Title III (IV-C) funds were employed during each year of the project.

NUMBER OF STAFF PAID FROM TITLE III (IV-C) FUNDS

STAFF	PROJECT YEAR							
	1975-76		1974-75		1973-74		1972-73	
	Number	FTE*	Number	FTE*	Number	FTE*	Number	FTE*
a. Teaching staff					2	2	2	2
b. Administrative staff	4	2.3	4	2.3	5	4	5	4
c. Other professional staff Secretary	1	.6	1	.6	1	1	1	1
d. Paraprofessionals					2	2	2	2
e. Other (specify) Materials Clerk			1	.2				
TOTAL	5	2.9	6	3.1	10	9	10	9

* Full-Time Equivalent (3 half-time staff would be equal to 1.5 full-time equivalents.)

NOTE: Learners may be regarded as the persons who receive instruction and/or other services. Learners may be students, teachers, administrators, aides, etc. They are the target population.

4. What percentage of learners from the first year of your project continued into the 2nd year? 100 %

Into the 3rd year? 73 % Into the 4th year? _____ % Into the 5th year? _____ %

5. What percentage of learners who first participated in your project during the 2nd year, continued into the 3rd year of the project? 73 % Into the 4th year? _____ % Into the 5th year? _____ %

6. How many NON-STUDENT learners (e.g., teachers, administrators, parents) received instruction and/or other services during the 1975-76 project year? 162 (number)

7. If STUDENTS were listed as individuals in any PRODUCT objective for this project, provide the information requested in item 7.a. and item 7.b. below.

a. Give the grade-level span (if the students were in graded classrooms) OR age range in years (if the students were in ungraded classrooms) of the student participants.

PROJECT YEAR	GRADE SPAN		AGE RANGE	
	Lowest	Highest	Youngest	Oldest
1975-76	K	8	5	15
1974-75	K	8	5	14
1973-74	K	8	5	14
1972-73	K	8	5	14

b. Give the number of student participants for the 1975-76 project year in each category of the table below: This material is unknown as a demonstration project for the Michigan Adoption Program.

	American Indian	Black	Oriental	Spanish Surnamed American	White and All Other Individuals NOT included in the Other Categories	TOTAL (Sum of Cols. 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Preschool						
Grades K-3						
Grades 4-6						
Grades 7-8						
Grades 9-12						
TOTAL						

5. All of the teachers who attended the 71-72 year workshop series continued into 72-73 as we had added to and refined our teacher inservice workshops greatly in the two beginning experimental/developmental years of the project. Basically, our inservice is designed to train a new group of teachers each year providing them consultation services only as requested in the third and fourth year. We did collect related data in 1973-74 as we prepared for state and federal validation team visits. At this time we collected information from all previously trained IMPACT teachers and on their use of the IMPACT box. The questionnaire reported that 73% of the teachers continued use of the IMPACT diagnostic/prescriptive system into the third year. In the fourth and fifth year we continued to locally train a new group each year but the project focus was on dissemination and adoption to other districts.

8. Restate all PRODUCT objectives from the 1975–76 project year as found in the final approved proposal. Be sure to include the criterion for success for each objective. For each objective provide the following information: (1) the ONE Common Goal of Michigan Education that is the primary focus of the objective (e.g., I–1, II–3, APP–1); (2) the number of PROJECT participants for whom the objective is applicable; (3) the source of data collected regarding the objective (e.g., CTBS scores from 3rd and 4th grade students, attitude questionnaire data from inservice participants); (4) how the data were collected (e.g., pretest/posttest, questionnaire after each inservice); (5) how the data were analyzed (e.g., t-test, tally of percentages) and (6) the results of the analysis (e.g., the t value = 3.07 with 17 degrees of freedom and is significant at the .05 alpha level, 35% of the participants met or exceeded the criterion).
(NUMBER ALL OBJECTIVES EXACTLY AS IN THE PROPOSAL.)

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE I	COMMON GOAL	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	SOURCE OF DATA	METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION	DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE	DATA ANALYSIS RESULTS
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Project Goal: To train staff of adapter/adopter districts to implement project goal; to train teachers to diagnose/prescribe and program for children who have specific learning and/or behavior problems.	II Democracy & Equal Opportunity Goal 3 Education of the Exceptional Person III Student Learning Goal 1 Basic Skills					
Project Objective: Students of teachers trained in IMPACT workshops will demonstrate mastery of performance objectives established on basis of assessment using the IMPACT diagnostic/prescriptive teaching system. Criterion for success is achievement of the stated behavioral objective by 75% of the students.		1. (Minimum of two students per teacher.) Within 12 districts of Berrien County 105 students were programmed for following IMPACT system.	Completed IMPACT Program Forms stating long range and short term objectives mastered.	Tally of Long Range Objectives Mastered.	Tally of percentage	82.9% of students mastered stated behavioral objectives (long range) 87% mastered short term stated behavioral objectives (See Table 1)

(ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES AS REQUIRED.)

8. Restate all PRODUCT objectives from the 1975–76 project year as found in the final approved proposal. Be sure to include the criterion for success for each objective. For each objective provide the following information: (1) the ONE Common Goal of Michigan Education that is the primary focus of the objective (e.g., I–1, II–3, APP–1); (2) the number of PROJECT participants for whom the objective is applicable; (3) the source of data collected regarding the objective (e.g., CTBS scores from 3rd and 4th grade students, attitude questionnaire data from inservice participants); (4) how the data were collected (e.g., pretest/posttest, questionnaire after each inservice); (5) how the data were analyzed (e.g., t-test, tally of percentages) and (6) the results of the analysis (e.g., the t value = 3.07 with 17 degrees of freedom and is significant at the .05 alpha level, 35% of the participants met or exceeded the criterion).
(NUMBER ALL OBJECTIVES EXACTLY AS IN THE PROPOSAL.)

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE I	COMMON GOAL	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	SOURCE OF DATA	METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION	DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE	DATA ANALYSIS RESULTS
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		2. Number of certified Sp. Ed. Handicapped E.I. 10 L.D. 20 E.M.I. 9 Other 5	B.C.I.S.D. Special Education files.	Count of Sp. Ed. students mainstreamed.	Tally	44 students in Berrien County Program 75-76 are certified Sp. Ed. students. Appendices: A. Student Program Form. B. Objective Recording Form. C. Academic Pre/Post Profile. D. Skill & Behavior Profile. E. Learning Process Profile.
		3. 40 students of Berrien County K-8.	Peabody Individual Achievement Test	Pre/Post Test	correlated t between pre and post test scores two-tailed test. Pearson Product Moment Correlations for Grade and Percentile Scores between Pre and Posttest.	Significant at .000 (Probability greater than one in 1,000) (See Table II) Significant at .01 (See Table III)

(ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES AS REQUIRED.)

Table I

Student Data Collection
from IMPACT Program Forms 1975-1976

Berrien County Areas	Long Range Objectives Met	Long Range Objectives Not Met	Total % Long Range Obj. Met		Short Term Objectives Met	Short Term Objectives Not Met	Total % S/Term Objectives Met	
River Valley	6	0	6/6	100%	25	7	25/32	78%
New Buffalo	4	0	4/4	100%	11	5	11/16	68%
Brandywine	5	2	5/7	71%	39	8	39/47	82%
Bridgman	4	2	4/6	66%	15	2	15/17	88%
Coloma	9	0	9/9	100%	33	2	33/35	94%
Eau Claire	18	2	18/20	90%	33	3	32/36	78%
Galien	4	0	4/4	100%	21	0	21/21	100%
Lakeshore	9	9	9/18	50%	52	11	52/63	82%
Niles	14	3	14/17	82%	65	7	65/72	90%
St. Joseph	14	6	14/20	70%	69	8	69/77	88%
Watervliet	2	1	2/3	66%	7	4	7/11	63%
Benton Harbor	5	0	5/5	100%	30	0	30/30	100%
Totals	94	25	94/115	83%	400	57	400/457	87%

Product Objective I

To collect uniform student data as a demonstration project is a difficult task. Adoptions and training periods for staff do not allow for maximum results to be achieved during the school year nor does the information collected lend itself to the evaluation form provided.

To document the project goal that staff trained in the I PACT system can and do diagnose/prescribe and program for children who have specific learning and/or behavior problems, a count was taken of the number of special education students involved in IMPACT. Special education students are those that have been evaluated by the school psychologist and determined by an EPPC (Educational Planning and Placement Committee) that services of the special education staff would be beneficial. Of the 105 students programmed using the IMPACT system 44 met special education requirements in the areas of Learning Disabled (20), Educably Minimally Retarded (9), Emotionally Impaired (10), Speech, Hearing and Others (5).

Twelve school districts within Berrien County sent a total of fifty-two teachers to the IMPACT five day workshops during the 75-76 school year. These schools paid for substitute teachers to release teachers attending the five day workshops and for the IMPACT Box for each teacher. The Berrien County Intermediate School District provide a Special Education Consultant staff to present the workshops and to do the monthly review of students objectives with the teacher. Nine of the fifty-two teachers are certified Special Education teachers in areas of EI, LD, EMI and speech. Although all students in the classes of these special education teachers are EPPC'd special ed. students, this report only reflects the minimum IMPACT goal of two student programs per teacher.

Product Objective I (cont.)

Because all student IMPACT Program Forms relate to the teachers implementing a series of behavioral objectives the IMPACT diagnostic/ prescriptive program, the IMPACT Staff selected the PIAT (Peabody Individual Achievement Test) as a means of comparing achievement gains. The test was administered to students in Berrien County in October and as a posttest in April. The PIAT is a standardized test designed to provide a wide range screening measure of achievement in areas of mathematics, reading, spelling, and general information. It should be noted that from pre test time to posttest is a period of six months. Therefore if a goal were that the students would gain one month for every month in school, a six month gain should be expected. However, students selected were those with specific learning problems and it should be realized that their learning rate is significantly lower. The test results indicate that the students gained, two months for every month in the program form pre test to posttest date. The following statistical information on student performance of the PIAT was compiled by Dr. Uldis Smidchens of the R.E.D.E. Center in Western Michigan University.

Table II

CORRELATED t TEST FOR STUDENT
Grade Equivalent Scores

	PRETEST		POSTTEST		GAIN		N	t*	p
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.			
MATH	3.68	2.85	4.51	2.58	0.82	1.63	38	3.12	.003
READING RECOGNITION	3.05	1.74	3.57	1.71	0.52	0.70	40	4.65	.000
READING COMPREHENSION	3.31	1.55	4.02	1.72	0.70	1.40	36	4.05	.000
SPELLING	2.69	1.27	3.35	1.72	0.66	1.21	40	3.45	.001
GENERAL INFORMATION	3.92	1.83	4.64	2.20	0.72	0.99	38	4.49	.000
TOTAL	3.11	1.57	3.77	1.64	0.65	0.54	38	7.47	.000

* Correlated t between pre and posttest scores
two-tailed test

Table 2 results indicate significant gains in all areas of academic achievement. The total score of .000 represents a probability of the student making this much growth by chance would happen only once in over one thousand times.

Table III

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS FOR GRADE EQUIVALENT AND PERCENTILE SCORES BETWEEN THE PRE AND POSTTESTS

	GRADE EQUIVALENT		PERCENTILES	
	n	r	n	r
MATH	38	.82	36	.59
READING RECOGNITION	40	.91	39	.82
READING COMPREHENSION	36	.80	33	.77
SPELLING	40	.71	35	.52
GENERAL INFORMATION	38	.89	39	.84
TOTAL	38	.94	34	.82

All p .01 two-tailed test

Results of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlations for Grade Equivalent and Percentile Scores between Pre-Posttests are significant at the .01 level of probability.

8. Restate all PRODUCT objectives from the 1975–76 project year as found in the final approved proposal. Be sure to include the criterion for success for each objective. For each objective provide the following information: (1) the ONE Common Goal of Michigan Education that is the primary focus of the objective (e.g., I–1, II–3, APP–1); (2) the number of PROJECT participants for whom the objective is applicable; (3) the source of data collected regarding the objective (e.g., CTBS scores from 3rd and 4th grade students, attitude questionnaire data from inservice participants); (4) how the data were collected (e.g., pretest/posttest, questionnaire after each inservice); (5) how the data were analyzed (e.g., t-test, tally of percentages) and (6) the results of the analysis (e.g., the t value = 3.07 with 17 degrees of freedom and is significant at the .05 alpha level, 35% of the participants met or exceeded the criterion).

(NUMBER ALL OBJECTIVES EXACTLY AS IN THE PROPOSAL.)

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE I	COMMON GOAL	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	SOURCE OF DATA	METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION	DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE	DATA ANALYSIS RESULTS
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Detroit Region V Adoption Findings.		Classrooms of eight IMPACT trained teachers.	1. IMPACT Series I and Series II Pre Posttest for teachers. 2. Pre Post classroom observation. 3. Pre Post teacher interview. 4. Pre Post principal interview. 5. Student pre posttest assessment of completed objectives.	1. Pre posttest of teachers.	Used only as teaching technique and self corrected.	School districts adopting program may or may not use parts or all of IMPACT evaluation material to still have an effective adoption. 2, 3 and 4 Not practical to do pre post on adopting district staff. Appendices. F. Teacher Interview. G. Principal Interview. H. Series I Pre/Posttest. I. Series II Pre/Posttest. J. Classroom Observation.

(ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES AS REQUIRED.)

8. Restate all PRODUCT objectives from the 1975–76 project year as found in the final approved proposal. Be sure to include the criterion for success for each objective. For each objective provide the following information: (1) the ONE Common Goal of Michigan Education that is the primary focus of the objective (e.g., I–1, II–3, APP–1); (2) the number of PROJECT participants for whom the objective is applicable; (3) the source of data collected regarding the objective (e.g., CTBS scores from 3rd and 4th grade students, attitude questionnaire data from inservice participants); (4) how the data were collected (e.g., pretest/posttest, questionnaire after each inservice); (5) how the data were analyzed (e.g., t-test, tally of percentages) and (6) the results of the analysis (e.g., the t value = 3.07 with 17 degrees of freedom and is significant at the .05 alpha level, 35% of the participants met or exceeded the criterion).

(NUMBER ALL OBJECTIVES EXACTLY AS IN THE PROPOSAL.)

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE I	COMMON GOAL	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	SOURCE OF DATA	METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION	DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE	DATA ANALYSIS RESULTS
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Adoption finding: Students of teachers trained in IMPACT in Detroit Region V.		Students of grade 2, 3, 4 and 5 IMPACT teachers.	Stanford Achievement Stanford Diag. Reading Gates MacGinitie CTBS Reading	Pre-Posttest	comparison of grade level gains.	Total gains represent 1 year and 1 month growth for average of five months from pre to posttest.

(ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES AS REQUIRED.)

Table IV

IMPACT

Test Results*

1975-76

Detroit Region V
IMPACT Classrooms

School		Test Given	Date Given	Expected Average Gain (to May, 76)	Actual Average Given
Bagley	4	Stanford Achievement	1/76	.4	.7
Higginbotham	2	Stanford Achievement	10/75	.7	1.3
Pasteur	3	Stanford Diag. Reading	11/75	.6	.4
Turner	2	Gates - MacGinitie	1/76	.4	.8
Vandenberg	5.	CTBS - Reading	1/76	.4.	.4
		Total		2.5	3.6

8. Restate all PRODUCT objectives from the 1975–76 project year as found in the final approved proposal. Be sure to include the criterion for success for each objective. For each objective provide the following information: (1) the ONE Common Goal of Michigan Education that is the primary focus of the objective (e.g., I–1, II–3, APP–1); (2) the number of PROJECT participants for whom the objective is applicable; (3) the source of data collected regarding the objective (e.g., CTBS scores from 3rd and 4th grade students, attitude questionnaire data from inservice participants); (4) how the data were collected (e.g., pretest/posttest, questionnaire after each inservice); (5) how the data were analyzed (e.g., t-test, tally of percentages) and (6) the results of the analysis (e.g., the t value = 3.07 with 17 degrees of freedom and is significant at the .05 alpha level, 35% of the participants met or exceeded the criterion).
(NUMBER ALL OBJECTIVES EXACTLY AS IN THE PROPOSAL.)

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE #2	COMMON GOAL	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	SOURCE OF DATA	METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION	DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE	DATA ANALYSIS RESULTS
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
The IMPACT demonstration staff will identify adopter/adapter districts during the 1975-76 school year who will meet certain commitment criteria. Criterion for success will be the Producer-Consumer Agreement signed by the adopting/adapting school district and the IMPACT staff.	II - 3 III - 1 Appendix a. A 1-2-3-4	9 School Districts	Letters of Interest Commitment Criteria State of Assurances Agreement for Services	Tally Count	Tally count. Comparsion of Adopting School districts with districts in Berrien County.	The attached Table V, indicate name of school district, school population, size of LEA. IMPACT staff trained by demonstration site, date for local program implementation and number in that plan. Appendices K. Commitment Criteria. L. Agreement for Services.

(ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES AS REQUIRED.)

Table V

IMPACT Adoptions 1975-76

Adopting District	K-12 Pop.	No. trained at demonstration Site	Implementation Date 75/76	Implementation Date 76/77	Schools with Demonstration Classes in Operation	Workshop Sessions & Date Implemented	IMPACT Materials Used	Consultants Available	L.E.A. Staff
Detroit Region V 1001 Puritan Detroit, Mi. 48238	31,000	12 2 Admin. 2 Consultants 8 teachers	x		4 grade Bagley 5 " " 3 " Hampton 4 " " 2 " Higginbotham 1 " MacDowell 3 " Pasteur 2 " Turner 5 " Vandenberg	I. 1-27-76 II. 4-1-76 III. 4-13-76 IV. 5-19-76 V. 6-3-76	Yes	Yes	15
Birmingham Public Sch. 550 W. Merrill Birmingham, Mi. 48012	12,158	15 1 Admin. 1 Principal 1 Consultant 12 Teachers		x	Walnut Lake Greenfield Pembroke Harlan Pierce	Awareness 5-14-76	Yes	Yes	9 to be trained 76-77.
Avondale 1435 West Auburn Rd. Rochester, Mi. 48063	3,765	12 2 Admin. 10 Teachers	x		Middle School Stone Elem. Stiles R. Grant Graham Elmwood	I. 11-75 II. 1-76 III. 2-76 IV. 3-76 V. 4-76	Yes	Yes	total K-9 staff (90 + teachers).
Gladstone Gladstone Area Sch. Gladstone, Mi. 49837		7 1 Admin. 1 Consultant 5 Teachers		x	Cameron Jones Flatrock	Plan to be implemented 76 - 77 Sept. Awareness Session Set up Demo. Classrooms Workshops I. 1-77 II. 2-77 III. 3-77 IV. 4-77 V. 5-77			10
Rock Public Schools Rock, Michigan 49880		5 1 Principal 4 Teachers		x	2	Same as above			6

Table V

IMPACT Adoptions 1975-76

Adopting District	K-12 Pop.	No. trained at demonstration Site	Implementation Date		Schools with Demonstration Classes in Operation	Workshop Sessions & Date Implemented	IMPACT Materials Used	Consultants Available	L.E.A. Staff
			75/76	76/77					
Big Bay de Noc Cooks, Mi. 49817	500	3 3 Teachers		x	2 Cooks	Same as above			14
Escanaba Area Pub. Sch. 1209 N. 19th Street Escanaba, Mi. 49829		6 1 Principal 5 Teachers		x	Webster Washington	Same as above			6
Bark River-Harris Sch. Harris, Mi. 49845		5 1 Principal 1 Consultant 3 Teachers		x	2	Same as above			5
Delta Schoolcraft ISD Sp. Ed. Building 810 N. Lincoln Rd. Escanaba, Mi. 49829		3		x	I.S.D. will support, provide materials, consultants services to districts with the counties of Delta and Schoolcraft.				20

8. Restate all PRODUCT objectives from the 1975–76 project year as found in the final approved proposal. Be sure to include the criterion for success for each objective. For each objective provide the following information: (1) the ONE Common Goal of Michigan Education that is the primary focus of the objective (e.g., I–1, II–3, APP–1); (2) the number of PROJECT participants for whom the objective is applicable; (3) the source of data collected regarding the objective (e.g., CTBS scores from 3rd and 4th grade students, attitude questionnaire data from inservice participants); (4) how the data were collected (e.g., pretest/posttest, questionnaire after each inservice); (5) how the data were analyzed (e.g., t-test, tally of percentages) and (6) the results of the analysis (e.g., the t value = 3.07 with 17 degrees of freedom and is significant at the .05 alpha level, 35% of the participants met or exceeded the criterion).
(NUMBER ALL OBJECTIVES EXACTLY AS IN THE PROPOSAL.)

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE #3	COMMON GOAL	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	SOURCE OF DATA	METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION	DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE	DATA ANALYSIS RESULTS
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
The IMPACT demonstration site staff will design, develop and assemble an information package by 11-15-75 that will allow adopting districts to provide IMPACT teacher training workshops at their local districts. Criterion for success will be the availability of the package.	II 3 III 1 Appendix A		Staff minutes. Material vouchers from adopting districts.	Tally count.	check-off system.	20 total IMPACT packages were developed containing the following: 1. Promotional filmstrip, cassette and script. 2. Five filmstrips, cassettes and scripts which will accompany five workshop sessions. 3. A workbook of 42 modules for teacher participants. 4. An instructor's manual of the 42 modules. 5. Five binders, one per workshop containing specific material for workshop implementation. 6. One IMPACT Box.

(ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES AS REQUIRED.)

8. Restate all PRODUCT objectives from the 1975–76 project year as found in the final approved proposal. Be sure to include the criterion for success for each objective. For each objective provide the following information: (1) the ONE Common Goal of Michigan Education that is the primary focus of the objective (e.g., I–1, II–3, APP–1); (2) the number of PROJECT participants for whom the objective is applicable; (3) the source of data collected regarding the objective (e.g., CTBS scores from 3rd and 4th grade students, attitude questionnaire data from inservice participants); (4) how the data were collected (e.g., pretest/posttest, questionnaire after each inservice); (5) how the data were analyzed (e.g., t-test, tally of percentages) and (6) the results of the analysis (e.g., the t value = 3.07 with 17 degrees of freedom and is significant at the .05 alpha level, 35% of the participants met or exceeded the criterion).
(NUMBER ALL OBJECTIVES EXACTLY AS IN THE PROPOSAL.)

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE #4	COMMON GOAL	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	SOURCE OF DATA	METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION	DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE	DATA ANALYSIS RESULTS
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Performance objective #4: Demonstration staff will disseminate IMPACT project during 1975-76 school year to school districts within Michigan, to local, state and national conferences. Dissemination material consists of: 1. Awareness Brochures 2. Promotional Filmstrip cassette and script 3. Pamphlet 4. Slides 5. Seminar and/or workshop 6. On site visits 7. Demonstration classrooms 8. The IMPACT workshop package 9. The IMPACT Box 10. The IMPACT modules in workbook form for teacher participants and IMPACT instructor (Instructor's Manual & IMPACT Manual) Criteria for success: The IMPACT staff will maintain an Information Dissemination timeline showing presentation dates and staff assignment. Timeline will be revised as needed.	II. Democracy & Equal Opportunity Goal 3 Education of the Exceptional Person III. Student Learning Goal 1 Basic Skills		1. Information Dissemination Timeline - records, presentations, dates, staff assignments and numbers in attendance.	Tally count		1. The timeline noting presentation topics and dates as well as presentor & number of persons in attendance maintained during the 1975-76 school year indicated IMPACT was disseminated to a total of 2771 persons at workshops, conventions, in-service seminars, high school and college classes and through newspaper articles. Parents, teachers, high school and college students from Berrien County attending presentations or reading newspaper articles numbered 1997. IMPACT was the subject of presentation at 21 meetings for 612 people throughout the state of Michigan

(ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES AS REQUIRED.)

8. Restate all PRODUCT objectives from the 1975–76 project year as found in the final approved proposal. Be sure to include the criterion for success for each objective. For each objective provide the following information: (1) the ONE Common Goal of Michigan Education that is the primary focus of the objective (e.g., I–1, II–3, APP–1); (2) the number of PROJECT participants for whom the objective is applicable; (3) the source of data collected regarding the objective (e.g., CTBS scores from 3rd and 4th grade students, attitude questionnaire data from inservice participants); (4) how the data were collected (e.g., pretest/posttest, questionnaire after each inservice); (5) how the data were analyzed (e.g., t-test, tally of percentages) and (6) the results of the analysis (e.g., the t value = 3.07 with 17 degrees of freedom and is significant at the .05 alpha level, 35% of the participants met or exceeded the criterion).
(NUMBER ALL OBJECTIVES EXACTLY AS IN THE PROPOSAL.)

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE	COMMON GOAL	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	SOURCE OF DATA	METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION	DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE	DATA ANALYSIS RESULTS
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
						162 professional educators from throughout the nation attended IMPACT workshop sessions at national and international conferences for the National Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development and the International Reading Association respectively. Workshop presentations utilized such materials as the IMPACT Box, manuals, filmstrips and cassettes, as well as slides and printed handouts.
			2. Information Request Form - records name, title, address, and type of information desired for each request made to project IMPACT as well as action	Tally count		Requests for information concerning project IMPACT were charted according to level of information desired (Level I - Awareness Knowledge;

(ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES AS REQUIRED.)

8. Restate all PRODUCT objectives from the 1975–76 project year as found in the final approved proposal. Be sure to include the criterion for success for each objective. For each objective provide the following information: (1) the ONE Common Goal of Michigan Education that is the primary focus of the objective (e.g., I–1, II–3, APP–1); (2) the number of PROJECT participants for whom the objective is applicable; (3) the source of data collected regarding the objective (e.g., CTBS scores from 3rd and 4th grade students, attitude questionnaire data from inservice participants); (4) how the data were collected (e.g., pretest/posttest, questionnaire after each inservice); (5) how the data were analyzed (e.g., t-test, tally of percentages) and (6) the results of the analysis (e.g., the t value = 3.07 with 17 degrees of freedom and is significant at the .05 alpha level, 35% of the participants met or exceeded the criterion).
(NUMBER ALL OBJECTIVES EXACTLY AS IN THE PROPOSAL.)

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE	COMMON GOAL	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	SOURCE OF DATA	METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION	DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE	DATA ANALYSIS RESULTS
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
			taken by IMPACT staff in response to the request			Level II - Decision-Confirmation) and the resulting action taken by the IMPACT staff. Action to be taken by IMPACT staff in response to requests for Level I material included the forwarding of IMPACT's Experimental & Demonstration Flier; IMPACT's letter, abstract and brochure; Academic Therapy's Flier concerning the IMPACT Box; "Did Today Matter?" IMPACT's promotional filmstrip & cassette; other printed material; phone calls. Categories of response for second level information (Decision-Confirmation) included the Letter of Intent; Planning Sessions with

(ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES AS REQUIRED.)

8. Restate all PRODUCT objectives from the 1975–76 project year as found in the final approved proposal. Be sure to include the criterion for success for each objective. For each objective provide the following information: (1) the ONE Common Goal of Michigan Education that is the primary focus of the objective (e.g., I–1, II–3, APP–1); (2) the number of PROJECT participants for whom the objective is applicable; (3) the source of data collected regarding the objective (e.g., CTBS scores from 3rd and 4th grade students, attitude questionnaire data from inservice participants); (4) how the data were collected (e.g., pretest/posttest, questionnaire after each inservice); (5) how the data were analyzed (e.g., t-test, tally of percentages) and (6) the results of the analysis (e.g., the t value = 3.07 with 17 degrees of freedom and is significant at the .05 alpha level, 35% of the participants met or exceeded the criterion).
(NUMBER ALL OBJECTIVES EXACTLY AS IN THE PROPOSAL.)

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE	COMMON GOAL	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	SOURCE OF DATA	METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION	DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE	DATA ANALYSIS RESULTS
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
						IMPACT staff; Statement of Assurance, Commitment Criteria; On-site Training; Delivery of IMPACT materials to adopting districts. IMPACT responded to 65 requests for Level I information during the 1975-76 school year by sending 50 Experimental and Demonstration Fliers; 25 letters, abstracts and brochures; and 25 fliers from Academic Therapy. The promotional filmstrip was loaned 30 times and staff members made 20 followup phone calls. From the 65 Level I requests 5 continued through all the steps of Level II. An additional 5 on-site visits were

(ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES AS REQUIRED.)

8. Restate all PRODUCT objectives from the 1975–76 project year as found in the final approved proposal. Be sure to include the criterion for success for each objective. For each objective provide the following information: (1) the ONE Common Goal of Michigan Education that is the primary focus of the objective (e.g., I–1, II–3, APP–1); (2) the number of PROJECT participants for whom the objective is applicable; (3) the source of data collected regarding the objective (e.g., CTBS scores from 3rd and 4th grade students, attitude questionnaire data from inservice participants); (4) how the data were collected (e.g., pretest/posttest, questionnaire after each inservice); (5) how the data were analyzed (e.g., t-test, tally of percentages) and (6) the results of the analysis (e.g., the t value = 3.07 with 17 degrees of freedom and is significant at the .05 alpha level; 35% of the participants met or exceeded the criterion).
(NUMBER ALL OBJECTIVES EXACTLY AS IN THE PROPOSAL.)

PRODUCT OBJECTIVE	COMMON GOAL	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	SOURCE OF DATA	METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION	DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE	DATA ANALYSIS RESULTS
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
			3. Visitor Log Book contains signatures, dates of visits and school affiliation of visitors to project IMPACT.	Tally count		also made. Printed materials were mailed to representatives from each of the sixty Intermediate School District units and the 600 school districts in Michigan. 162 persons attended IMPACT workshop sessions during the 1975-76 school year. In addition logs were kept by each of the demonstration teachers in Berrien County to record visits. Appendix M. Timeline

(ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES AS REQUIRED.)

Product Objective #4

Further dissemination of Project IMPACT occurred indirectly. For example, districts adopting IMPACT have assisted dissemination efforts at both state and national levels. Avondale School District has distributed monthly fliers to all of its elementary teachers listing common teaching concerns paired with solutions contained in the IMPACT Box, helpful classroom hints from demonstration classroom teachers, and ideas for centers. Mrs. Louise Couture, Curriculum Director of the Avondale Public Schools, participated in a panel discussion for Title III Directors by explaining her school system's adoption and implementation of project IMPACT. The Berrien County IMPACT staff was aided in its presentation at the Michigan Compensatory Education Fair by members of the Avondale and Birmingham local IMPACT staffs. Detroit Region V's booklet of programs, including IMPACT, was distributed at the fair as were IMPACT pins and bumper stickers.

Directors from Detroit Region V's IMPACT staff contributed to the IMPACT presentation for the NASCD (National Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development) in Miami, Florida.

A resume of an abstract submitted to the 1975 Southwest Regional Reading Association meeting in Phoenix, Arizona appeared in the February 1976 issue of RESOURCES IN EDUCATION, the monthly publication of the Educational Resources Information Center. The abstract is also scheduled to appear in EXCEPTIONAL CHILD EDUCATIONAL ABSTRACTS, the Council for Exceptional Children's Informational Center's quarterly publication.

A brief abstract concerning IMPACT's goals, implementation, and educational

Product Objective #4 (cont.)

relevance was published in the International Reading Association Program Abstracts for the 12,000 attending the 1976 International Convention in Anaheim, California.

Academic Therapy, current publishers of the IMPACT Box, has likewise contributed to IMPACT dissemination efforts through advertisements in its Journal and displays at education related conventions.

Participants in IMPACT workshop series have often made requests for materials to use at teacher in-service meetings or college courses at which they present a portion of the IMPACT program. It is impossible to chart the numbers of people who have attended such meetings or even the meetings themselves since knowledge of such presentations comes to the IMPACT staff informally via word-of-mouth.

9. If you used a PRETEST-POSTTEST DESIGN using standardized NORM-REFERENCED instruments as part of your evaluation, complete the form below.

COLUMN INSTRUCTIONS:

COLUMN 1: Provide the name, level and edition of the test used.
COLUMNS 2–3: Provide MONTH, DAY and YEAR of pretest and posttest applications. If you cannot remember the exact dates, please estimate them as closely as possible.
COLUMN 4: For student learners, provide the grade level of the students tested. Provide separate information for each grade level if available. For nonstudent learners, put NS. Provide separate information for each separate group if available.
COLUMN 5: Provide the number of learners for whom BOTH pretest and posttest scores are available.
COLUMN 6: Provide the type of score reported, (e.g., standard scores, percentiles, grade equivalent units).
COLUMN 7: Provide an estimate of the average hours the learners were involved in the project between PRETEST and POSTTEST.
COLUMNS 8–9: Provide the pretest and posttest averages based upon only those learners for whom BOTH pretest and posttest scores are available.
COLUMN 10: Identify by number the project objective(s) (product or process) that required the use of the test.

NAME, LEVEL AND EDITION OF TEST	WHEN ADMINISTERED (Month, Day and Year)		GRADE	NUMBER OF LEARNERS TESTED	TYPE OF SCORE	AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS LEARNERS INVOLVED IN PROJECT	PRE-TEST AVG.	POST-TEST AVG.	PROJECT OBJECTIVE NUMBER
	Pretest	Posttest							
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Peabody Individual Achievement Test	10-20-75	4-10-76	1	6	Grade Equivalent	90	1.0	1.5	1
K-12 areas of Math, Reading, Spelling			2	6	"		1.5	2.2	
and General Infor. American Guid. @1970			3	6			2.3	2.7	
			4	4			4.8	5.4	
			5	10			4.1	8.4	
			6	5			4.8	5.4	
			7	1			4.6	5.1	
			8	1			2.7	3.2	
Totals				39			3.2	4.2	

10. If you used a PRETEST-POSTTEST DESIGN or a POSTTEST ONLY DESIGN using OBJECTIVE-REFERENCED instruments as part of your evaluation, complete the form below.

COLUMN INSTRUCTIONS:

COLUMN 1: Provide the name and description of the objective-referenced test used. You may need to use an attached sheet for a description of an objective-referenced test. (IF YOU HAVE DEVELOPED YOUR OWN TEST, ATTACH A COPY OF IT.)

COLUMNS 2–3: Provide MONTH, DAY and YEAR of pretest (if given) and posttest applications. If you cannot remember the exact dates, please estimate them as closely as possible.

COLUMN 4: For student learners, provide the grade level of the students tested. Provide separate information for each grade level if available. For nonstudent learners, put NS. Provide separate information for each separate group if available.

COLUMN 5: Provide the number of learners tested. For pretest-posttest designs this is the number of learners for whom BOTH pretest and posttest scores are available.

COLUMN 6: Provide LOWEST percentage of objectives attained by a SINGLE learner, based on the pretest application. If no pretest was given, put NA.

COLUMN 7: Provide HIGHEST percentage of objectives attained by a SINGLE learner, based on the pretest application. If no pretest was given, put NA.

COLUMN 8: For pretest-posttest designs, provide an estimate of the average hours the learners were involved in the project between the PRETEST and the POSTTEST. For posttest only designs, provide an estimate of the average hours the learners were involved in the project prior to the posttest.

COLUMNS 9–10: For pretest-posttest designs, provide the average number of objectives attained based on the pretest and posttest applications. These averages should be based upon only those learners for whom BOTH pretest and posttest scores are available. For posttest only designs, use ONLY column 10, and provide the average number of objectives attained based on the posttest application.

COLUMN 11: Identify by number the project objective(s) (product or process) which required the use of the test.

NOTE: If narrative in required to clarify results, prepare narrative on separate sheet and attach.

TEST NAME AND DESCRIPTION	WHEN ADMINISTERED (Month, Day and Year)		GRADE	NUMBER OF LEARNERS TESTED	PERCENTAGE OF OBJECTIVES ATTAINED		AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS LEARNERS INVOLVED IN PROJECT	PRE-TEST AVG.	POST-TEST AVG.	PROJECT OBJECTIVE NUMBER
	Pretest	Posttest			Lowest	Highest				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
										/

11. Excluding any published tests listed in response to item 9 or 10, indicate below the name of each instrument used in your evaluation (e.g., teacher-made tests, questionnaires completed by teachers or parents). For each instrument listed, indicate the number of the project objective(s) (product or process) with which it was used and whether reliability and validity data are available.
Attach to this form a copy of each instrument listed below. Also include any reliability, validity or other pertinent data which are available for each instrument.

(ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES AS NEEDED)

TEST NAME	PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) NUMBER	RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY DATA? (Answer Yes or No.)
IMPACT Academic Skill & Behavior Inventories	1	no
" Learning Process Inventories	1	
" Teacher Form Part I — Observation of	1 & 2	
" Coordinator Form Part II — Adopting Districts	1 & 2	

12. Did you use a comparison group in any part of your evaluation design?

☒ YES
☐ NO

If "YES," describe how the members of that group were selected (e.g., randomly assigned from persons volunteering for project activities, all non-project persons) and give data to support their equivalence to the project participants (e.g., test scores, age and grade, professional training).

Comparisons were made only in areas of school population of districts adopting project IMPACT with those in Berrien County. The IMPACT project materials seem to meet educational needs in districts with small rural population to the large metropolitan areas.

Table V

Comparison of Size of Schools Using IMPACT

K-12	Berrien County	Adoptions
I. 50,000 +		Detroit Region V
II. 20,000 - 49,999	------	------
III. 10,000 - 19,999	Benton Harbor	*Delta Schoolcraft ISD
IV. 4,000 - 9,999	Niles	Birmingham
	St. Joseph	Avondale
	Lakeshore	Escanaba
V. 1,000 - 3,999	Watervliet	Gladstone
	New Buffalo	
	Bridgman	
	Brandywine	
	Berrien Springs	
	Coloma	
	River Valley	
	Eau Claire	
	Buchanan	
VI. 0 - 999	Galien	Rock
		Bark River
		Big Bay de Noc

CERTIFICATION: I certify that the information submitted on this report is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Date 7-14-76 Superintendent or Authorized Official Raymond M. Sreboth (Signature)

Raymond M. Sreboth, Superintendent (Type name and title)

Contact Person Elaine Weckler (Type name) Telephone (616) 471-7725 Area Code/Local No.

III. Judgments of Worth.

A. Value of Outcomes.

Projects operating as demonstration sites for the Michigan Adoption Program can effect educational changes. Many existing programs can meet educational needs of other districts. The Michigan Adoption Program to develop a system of identifying, retrieving and validating those systems that have been tested can save tax dollars. There is substantially much less money invested when a school district adopts an existing program than when funds are given for planning, developing and experimenting a new project.

IMPACT diagnostic/prescriptive system can be implemented in a variety of differing educational settings. IMPACT has been implemented in large metropolitan cities as well as small rural areas. The system works equally well with varying socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds.

IMPACT workshop materials are structured to provide ease in implementing the workshops yet flexible enough to be used with the existing curriculum. IMPACT Instructor's Manual provides specifics for establishing demonstration classrooms while offering a variety of options.

The Commitment Criteria established by the IMPACT staff was met. IMPACT workshops using IMPACT material, demonstration classrooms and a consultant plan was followed in districts trained early in the 1975-76 school year. Districts trained late in that school year implemented demonstration classrooms and developed a plan for workshops and consultant followup to be implemented in the 1976-77 school year.

Students trained by IMPACT teachers made educational gains in academic

achievement on the Peabody Individual Achievement Standardized Test significant at the .000 level of probability. Educationally handicapped students made educational gains when mainstreamed into classrooms of IMPACT trained teachers. Forty-one percent of students tested were certified by EPPC (Educational Planning and Placement Committee) as educationally handicapped in either E.I. (Emotionally Impaired), L.D. (Learning Disabled) or E.M.I. (Educationally Mentally Impaired) areas.

Michigan State Unversity continues to grant college credit for workshop participants enrolled in IMPACT training.

Nine school districts in Michigan adopted the IMPACT educational system during the 1975-76 school year through the Michigan Adoption Program of the Michigan Department of Education.

Academic Therapy of San Rafael, California, commercially publishes the IMPACT Box.

ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) printed an abstract on: IMPACT Part I - Mainstreaming Learning Problems in the Classroom and Part II - Dissemination at the University, in the February 1976 issue of Resources in Education. The resume will also appear in the CEC Information Center's quarterly publication Exceptional Child Educational Abstracts (ECEA) and in bibliographies issued by the Information Center. The microfiche and hard copy reproductions of the complete document are disseminated through the ERIC Clearing House on Handicapped and Gifted Children.

Appendix

I. IMPACT Materials Used to Document Student Change.

A. IMPACT Academic Skill and Behavior Inventories and IMPACT Learning Process Inventories (In accompanying envelop.)

B. IMPACT Academic Skill and Behavior Profile.

C. IMPACT Academic Assessment Pre/Post Profile.

D. IMPACT Student Program Form.

E. IMPACT Learning Process Profile.

F. Recording Form for Behavioral Objectives.

II. IMPACT Materials Used to Document Teacher Change.

G. IMPACT Pre/Post Workshop Teacher Interview.

H. IMPACT Pre/Post Workshop Principal Interview.

I. IMPACT Pre/Post Workshop Series I.

J. IMPACT Pre/Post Workshop Series II.

K. IMPACT Pre/Post Workshop Classroom Observation Form.

(G - K Available to adopting districts L.E.A. - IMPACT team.)

III. IMPACT Materials Used to Document Program Adoptions.

L. Request for Information.

M. Timeline.

N. Commitment Criteria.

O. Agreement of Services.

P. Teacher Form for Adopting Districts.

Q. Coordinator Form for Adopting Districts.

Academic Skill Assessment and Programming
Skill and Behavior Assessment Profile

IMPACT: Instructional Model Program For All Children & Teachers

Child _____ Teacher/School _____
Age _____ Grade _____ Year _____
Statement of Major Problems: _____

Strengths: _____

Level I:	Level II: Informal Assessment/Inventories and Observation
	Reading Auditory
	Reading Visual
	Other Reading Skills
	Mathematics
	Language
	Motor
	Behavior

B. *The Skill and Behavior Assessment Profile is used for recording observed strengths and weaknesses of students academic and behavior performances.*

Place a star beside one or two skill deficits or behavior problems you have identified in your assessment around which we will build a program.

IMPACT

Instructional Model Program for All Children and Teachers

ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT PRE-POST PROFILE

Pre				Post				TOPIC	Long Range Obj. met	Date
								READING VISUAL		
								Readiness:		
/9				/9				Recognizes colors		
/-				/-				Recognizes shapes		
/20				/20				Matches, Sequences, Copies		
/23				/23				Consonants		
/9				/9				Consonant Digraphs		
/28				/28				Consonant Blends		
								Vowels:		
/5				/5				Long		
/5				/5				Short		
/5				/5				Controlled Vowels		
/19				/19				Diphthongs Digraphs		
								Sight Vocabulary:		
/40				/40				First grade		
/40				/40				Second grade		
/40				/40				Third grade		
								READING AUDITORY		
/10				/10				Readiness		
/21	/28			/21	/28			Consonants		
/13				/13				Consonants Digraphs		
/28				/28				Consonant Blends		
/4				/4				Silent Letters		
								Vowels:		
/5				/5				I-Initial		
/5				/5				I-Medial		
/5				/5				O-Initial		
/5				/5				O-Medial		
/16				/16				Diphthongs Digraphs		
/5				/5				Controlled		
								READING OTHER		
/14	/10	/7		/14	/10	/7		Concept Development		
/3	/6			/3	/6			Word Division		
/12				/12				Contractions		
/11	/6	/6	/12	/11	/6	/6	/12	Structural Analysis		
/14				/14				Comprehension		
								MATHEMATICS		
/10				/10				Number Set		
/5				/5				Number System - Counting		
/22				/22				Numeration System		
/9				/9				Time		
/9				/9				Measurement		
/3				/3				Money		
/37				/37				Addition		
/24				/24				Subtraction		
/23				/23				Multiplication		
/12				/12				Division		
								MOTOR		
/12				/12				Gross		
/21				/21				Fine		
								LANGUAGE		
/9				/9				Spoken		
/4*	/6			/4*	/6			Written		
/9*				/9*				Spelling		

* Lower numerator indicates improvement

C. *The Academic Assessment Pre/Post Profile is used for recording scores of the informal inventories.*

Ac/ ic Skill Assessment and Programming
IM . Program Form

Child _____ Teacher/School _____ Age _____ Grade _____ Year _____

Problem _____ Strengths _____

Long Range Objective

Short Term Objective	Program, Initiation Date, Revisions	Date: Results:
D. The IMPACT Student Program Form is used to record the students performance on stated long term and short term objectives.	Revisions:	
Short Term Objective:	Date: Program Revisions:	Date: Results:
Short Term Objective:	Date: Program: Revisions:	Date: Results:

Child _____ School _____

Teacher _____ Date _____

1. "Symptoms": place checks in boxes corresponding to observed symptoms.
2. "Test Items": the denominator of each fraction is the total possible correct responses for each item. Fill in the numerator, using the number of correct responses actually performed.
3. "Strength-Weakness": place a check mark under "Strength" or "Weakness" for each process (this can be determined from symptoms and testing.
4. Select one area of need and record under "Major Problem Area."

	Symptoms				Test Items					Strength	Weakness
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5		
Haptic Discrimination											
					/12	/3	/4				
					/8	/8	/8				
Auditory Discrimination											
					/3	/3	/5				
					/10	/10	/5				
					/25	/9	/6				
						/3	/4				
							/2				
								/6			
					/5	/6	/6				
Visual Discrimination											
					/1	/1	/1				
					/1	/2	/3	/2			
					/1	/1	/1	/2			
Visual Memory											
Sequential					/1	/1	/1	/1			
Non-sequential					/1	/1	/1	/1	/1		
Visual Closure											
Missing Parts					/1	/1	/1	/1	/5		
Motor Expression											
Gross					/4	/5	/6				
Fine					/6	/4	/4				
Vocal Expression											
					/4						

MAJOR PROBLEM AREA: _____

E. The Learning Process Assessment Profile is used to record results of the Learning Process Inventories.

F. The Recording Form Behavioral Objectives is used by consultants to document and tally completed objectives.

IMPACT
Instructional Model Program for All Children and Teachers

Teacher & Student Name	Acad.	Beh.	LP	Short Term Objectives	Long Term Objec.	EI	MI	LD	V
T.									
1.									
2.									
3.									
4.									
T.									
1.									
2.									
3.									
4.									
T.									
1.									
2.									
3.									
4.									

IMPACT

Pre-Workshop Teacher Interview

Appendix G

Teacher's Name: _____ Grade Level: _____

The purpose of this interview is to develop a profile of teachers participating in the IMPACT Workshop. Without this information the needs and skills of the workshop participants are difficult to identify. Please answer all the questions to the best of your ability.

1. In which of the following seating arrangements is most of your classwork done?

   a. desks in a row ☐
   b. desks in a circle ☐
   c. changes with activities ☐
   d. desks in groups ☐
   e. other _____

2. Did you find it necessary to rearrange materials storage facilities?

   Yes ☐
   No ☐

3. How are most of your teaching materials stored?

   a. open cabinet ☐
   b. closed cabinet ☐
   c. materials close to place needed ☐
   d. children regularly get the materials themselves ☐
   e. teacher gets materials ☐
   f. other _____

4. Do you regularly display student work?

   Yes ☐
   No ☐

5. Do you use specific techniques or procedures for classroom management?

   Yes ☐
   No ☐

6. How would you describe the techniques you use for managing behavior? (check as many as apply)

   stating rules ☐
   approval ☐
   ignoring ☐
   disapproval ☐
   punishment ☐
   exclusion ☐
   other ☐
   Specify _____

7. Are you presently satisfied with the climate of your classroom?

Yes ☐
No ☐

If not, what changes would you like to see? _____

_____

8. Have you noticed any changes in the behavior of a specific child as a result of a specific behavior management technique?

Yes ☐
No ☐

If yes, what was the technique? _____

_____

9. Do you presently have learning centers in your classroom?

Yes ☐
No ☐

If yes, how long have you been operating learning centers in your classroom?

1 year ☐
2-5 years ☐
Always ☐

How are the centers used? (check as many as apply)

learning with teacher ☐
small group, no teacher ☐
independent work ☐
remedial work ☐
reinforcement activities ☐
exploratory activities ☐

If no learning centers, why?

a. lack of space ☐
b. lack of materials ☐
c. group of children not suitable ☐
d. program not suitable ☐
e. other _____

_____

10. If you have learning centers what content areas are the subject of the centers?

reading ☐
math ☐
language ☐
perceptual training ☐
remedial ☐
other _____

_____

How many children use the center(s)?

1- 5 ☐
5-10 ☐
10-20 ☐
all ☐

11. Do you presently use special materials for children with learning problems?

Yes ☐
No ☐

If yes, what are the materials?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

12. Where did you obtain the special materials?

IMPACT ☐
county office ☐
local district ☐
personal purchase ☐
teacher made ☐
other _____
_____

13. Do you presently need additional material and/or equipment in order to meet the needs of special children?

Yes ☐
No ☐

What materials? _____
_____
_____

14. Have you presently identified a special child in your room who needs special consideration in respect to teaching?

Yes ☐
No ☐

If yes:

a. have you assessed the child's problem?

Yes ☐
No ☐

b. What kind of diagnostic information do you have on the child?

- teacher assessment-formal ☐
- teacher assessment-informal ☐
- neither ☐
- consultant produced ☐

c. Have you been able to specify the child's problem?

- Yes ☐
- No ☐

d. Have you identified objectives for this child?

- Yes ☐
- No ☐

e. Are the objectives in a written form for inspection?

- Yes ☐
- No ☐

f. Are you using special materials or techniques for teaching this child?

- Yes ☐
- No ☐

Materials _____

_____

Techniques _____

_____

g. How are you meeting the needs of this child?

- altering assignments ☐
- individual remediation ☐
- behavior management ☐
- other _____

_____

15. Attitude changes:

a. Does the child seem to fit into your classroom better since you have started his/her program?

- Yes ☐
- No ☐

b. If yes, in what way does the special child seem to better fit into the class. Specify.

i. _____
ii. _____

c. If he/she is having more problems adjusting, what are the problems?

i. _____
ii. _____

d. Do you seem to understand this special child better now?

Yes ☐
No ☐

Specify _____
_____
_____

e. Has your attitude changed in respect to this child?

Yes ☐
No ☐

Specify _____
_____
_____

The Child

a. Have you noticed any change in the child's attitude about learning?

Yes ☐
No ☐

Specify _____
_____
_____

b. Have you noticed any change in the child's attitude about himself as a learner?

Specify _____
_____
_____

c. Have you noticed any change in the attitude of the child toward you as his teacher?

Yes ☐
No ☐

Specify _____
_____
_____

d. Have you noticed any change in the child's attitude toward other children?

Yes ☐
No ☐

Specify _____
_____
_____

e. Have you noticed any change of other children's attitude toward the special child?

Yes ☐
No ☐

Specify _____
_____
_____

General Questions:

Please indicate which of the following statements are consistent characteristics of your teaching behavior:

16. Capability levels

a. Shortening assignments when many children do not finish. ☐
b. Providing less difficult lessons or assignments when many children do not attain at least 75% accuracy. ☐
c. Evaluating children's work regularly. ☐
d. Recording progress regulary. ☐

17. Individual programming

a. Obtaining standardized test scores. ☐
b. Evaluating children's work regularly. ☐
c. Determing interests. ☐
d. Using methods and materials which capitalize on the students' strong receptive modalities. ☐
e. Using divergent or open-ended questions. ☐
f. Providing individual attention through the use of more capable classroom students with less capable cross-grade tutors, aides, parents, senior citizens, high school or college students. ☐

18. Feedback and reinforcement

a. Providing answer sheets. ☐
b. Using programmed materials. ☐
c. Approving of appropriate academic responses by smiling, praising, touching, applauding, or rewarding with tangibles such as checks, stars, chart marks, tokens, food, privileges, toys. ☐

19. Providing self-selected materials and activities within structured choices.

a. Allowing the children to choose an area of the room in which to pursue an activity. ☐
b. Allowing children to choose with whom, if anyone, they work. ☐
c. Providing limitations on choices of areas of the room, activities and materials, and work companions according to the child's ability to function well within freedom. ☐
d. Providing a choice of at least two reinforcement activities following directed instruction. ☐

20. Selecting and storing materials where they can easily be reached by children and teacher.

a. Constructing a materials storage area open to children near where it will be used. ☐
b. Storing playground equipment in an area to which children have access, i.e., the children distribute and return equipment. ☐

21. Providing opportunity for freedom of movement within socially accepted guidelines by:

a. Permitting children to go individually to the restroom as the need occurs. Providing cards for boys and girls at the door to limit the number in the restroom at any one time, may facilitate the procedure. ☐
b. Having children move from one activity area to another at least every half hour. This may be facilitated by turning lights on when it is time to move. ☐
c. Permitting children to move freely to an individual cubicle, carrel, or other isolated area to work away from distraction. ☐
d. Allowing children to sit or lie on the floor in some activity areas; providing cushions, overstuffed pillows, or large cardboard boxes, may encourage children to make use of the floor. ☐

22. Providing opportunity for children to interact together on learning tasks.

a. Have selected children work in pairs, e.g. a student with a deficiency working with a student having no such deficiency. ☐
b. Having all children work in pairs on learning tasks. ☐
c. Organizing small groups or committees to work on group projects. ☐
d. Permitting interaction between any students as long as the interaction concerns a learning task. ☐

23. Encouraging and providing guidelines and opportunities to work independently at assigned or chosen tasks by:

a. Posting a list of activities to accomplish and have students work on the activities in any order they wish, may be effective. ☐
b. Establishing activity or learning centers at which students pursue assigned or chosen tasks independently. ☐
c. Establishing rules for the independent activity time, e.g. "Talk with other children only about the learning task." ☐
d. Providing small cubicles, carrels, or other isolated areas for individuals to work independently without distraction. ☐
e. Providing time limits within which tasks are to be completed. An eventimer may provide motivation. ☐

24. Providing behavioral guidelines and encouraging socially appropriate behavior by:

a. Establishing rules which are:

i. Clearly stated and posted. ☐
ii. Short and to the point. ☐
iii. Few in number. ☐
iv. Decided upon with class involvement. ☐
v. Stated behaviorally. ☐
vi. Phrased in a positive way. ☐
vii. Applicable to specific situations. ☐
viii. Reviewed regulary. ☐

b. Ignoring inappropriate behavior which does not threaten the safety of others, is not destructive of school property, or does not seriously disrupt the classroom. ☐
c. Maintaining a ratio of four approvals of social behavior to one disapproval for each child. ☐

IMPACT

Appendix H

Field Data Collection
Pre/Post Workshop Principal Interview

Teacher's Name: _____ Grade Level: _____

The following questions are being presented for the purpose of identifying your impression of teachers under your supervision who are to attend the IMPACT workshops. Please answer each question to the best of your ability on the basis of your interaction with the teacher in question.

1. How would you rate the attitude of the teacher toward children with learning problems?

positive	/ /
negative	/ /
indifferent	/ /

2. How would you rate the teacher's awareness of various kinds of exceptional children?

knowledgable	/ /
average	/ /
little knowledge	/ /

3. How would you rate the physical arrangement of the teachers room?

traditional	/ /
flexible and adaptable	/ /

4. How does the teacher handle problems in her classroom?

teacher effectively treats problem	/ /
refers to principal	/ /
refers to other personnel	/ /

5. How would you rate the teacher's awareness of services available to children with learning problems?

very knowledgable	/ /
needs assistance in referral process	/ /
awareness	/ /

6. How would you rate the teacher's ability to manage behavior problems?

very skillful	/ /
average	/ /
improvement needed	/ /

7. How would you rate the teacher in terms of knowledge of methods and materials which are appropriate for working with children exhibiting a learning problem?

Very Knowledgable	/ /
Average	/ /
Needs assistance	/ /

8. Does the teacher presently have learning centers in the classroom?

Yes	/ /
No	/ /

9. Is the teacher presently making special provisions for a child with learning problems?

Yes	/ /
No	/ /

If yes, what provisions: _____

_____

_____

10. Please indicate five (5) specific knowledges and/or skills you expect the teacher to gain as a function of the INTACT workshop.

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

d. _____

e. _____

11. Rate the teacher from 1-5 (1 being the highest rating) on the following factors

Classroom Organization	1	2	3	4	5
Instructional skills	1	2	3	4	5
Understanding of learning process	1	2	3	4	5
Assessment of learning problems	1	2	3	4	5
Development of educational programs	1	2	3	4	5
Variety in instructional strategies	1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge of ancillary services	1	2	3	4	5
Writing instructional objectives	1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge of child development	1	2	3	4	5
Behavior management	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix I

IMPACT
Instructional Model Program for All Children and Teachers

Workshop Series I
Pre/Posttest

Select or write in the most appropriate responses for the following items. Please do not fail to complete your name and school in the appropriate blanks at the end of the test.

1. Which of the following statements is not accurate?

   a. IMPACT stands for Innovative Movement Project for All Classroom Teachers.
   b. IMPACT received the National Pacesetter Award.
   c. The Project's goal is to develop and implement a flexible instructional model.
   d. Activities of the program are limited to the IMPACT Box, the workshop program and information dissemination.

2. Fill in the remaining components of an IMPACT module:

   a.
   b. materials.
   c.
   d. delivery system.
   e.

3. With which of the following does the IMPACT workshop attempt to provide teachers?

   a. skills in assessing special learning and behavior problems.
   b. skills in dealing with parents.
   c. skills in selecting and using materials and techniques appropriate for special learning and behavior problems.
   d. a systematic procedure for recording a diagnostic-prescriptive process.
   e. all the right answers.
   f. assistance in implementing a success-oriented curriculum.

4. List two reasons the IMPACT workshop initially focuses on academic skills and behavior rather than learning processes.

   a. _____

   _____

   b. _____

   _____

5. Which of the following is not a procedure by which a teacher may provide tasks for children which are within their capability?

   a. shortening assignments.
   b. recording progress regularly.
   c. providing answer sheets.
   d. relating material to child's experience and interest.

6. Which of the following is not a procedure by which the teacher can provide feedback to a student?

   a. providing answer sheets.
   b. allowing the child to choose academic activity.
   c. color-coding answers.
   d. using divergent or open-ended questions.

7. List three characteristics which are indicative of a child with emotional disturbance or adjustment problems.

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

8. List three characteristics indicative of a child with a learning disability.

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

9. List three sensory modalities and two expressive modalities used in the IMPACT learning model.

Sensory Modalities	Expressive Modalities
a. _____	d. _____
b. _____	e. _____
c. _____	

10. Which of the following is an "instructional factor" resulting in poor achievement?

a. cultural bias of middle class education.
b. poor school attendance.
c. disturbing home situation.
d. mental retardation.
e. poor teaching.

11. Which of the following may be an indication that the child is a poor auditory learner?

a. can't recognize shapes and colors.
b. can't select or write the correct letter when a vowel sound is given.
c. can't detect the difference in length between a short spoken word and a long one.
d. can't give the correct sounds when consonants are shown.

12. Which of the following is a behavioral characteristic?

a. hits.
b. anxious.
c. yells.
d. stares.
e. shy.

13. Which of the following would be of little or no use in specifying the behavior of a child?

a. withdrawn.
b. reads.
c. disturbs classroom.
d. hits.
e. spits.

14. Tommy, being sent home for fighting on the playground, is an example of: (choose one)

a. reward.
b. behavior.
c. consequence.
d. antecedent.
e. stimulus.

15. Tommy was called a dirty name prior to hitting his friend. This is an example of: (choose one)

a. antecedent.
b. stimulus.
c. consequences.
d. punishment.
e. behavior.

16. Which of the following are not among the procedures for completing a Program Form?

a. Select and record one problem to concentrate on.
b. Place a star beside one or two identified problems.
c. Develop a long-range behavioral objective.
d. Design a short-term objective as a step towards the long-range objective.
e. Record progress only when an objective is met.

17. List the three major components of a behavioral objective.

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

18. The following statement is a good behavioral objective. "The child will gain a complete understanding of the meaning of democracy at the 100% accuracy level."

_____ True

_____ False

19. The following statement "The child will raise his hand and be recognized by the instructor before speaking 100% of the time during reading class" is an example of: (choose one)

a. educational goal.
b. short-term behavioral objective.
c. long-term behavioral objective.
d. educational behavioral objective.

20. Which of the following is an appropriate material for learning reading and language skills?

a. Cyclo-teacher.
b. Password.
c. Bowmar kit.
d. pegs and patterns.

21. Which of the following materials are appropriate for teaching mathematics skills?

a. Tabletamer.
b. Motivators.
c. Try kit.
d. Combinations are fun.

22. List the components of the RAID behavior management program.

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

d. _____

23. Which of the following are characteristics of good classroom rules?

a. Rules are kept short, to the point, and few in number.
b. Rules are stated clearly and behaviorally.
c. Rules are phrased positively whenever possible.
d. Rules are posted in conspicuous place and reviewed regularly.
e. Remind the class whenever someone breaks the rules.

24. List three examples of disapproval which are appropriate in classroom management.

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

25. Which of the following is not a principle of the RAID behavior management program?

a. Children learn best in a neutral environment.
b. Children become successful by struggling to overcome frequent failures.
c. Good rules provide guides to appropriate behavior.
d. We must catch the child being good.
e. The program is effective only to the degree that it is used consistently.

26. Which of the following should be included in a written remedial program for a child with learning problems?

a. Name of the commercial or teacher-made material.
b. Motivating strategies.
c. Target date for the objective.
d. List of strengths and weaknesses.
e. Frequency of use.

27. List the three remaining components of a behavior modification technique which must be considered:

a. behavior or strategy of the teacher.
b. _____

c. _____

d. _____

NAME: _____

SCHOOL: _____

TEACHING POSITION: _____

DATE: _____

IMPACT
Instructional Model Program for All Children and Teachers *Appendix J*

Workshop Series II
Pre/Posttest

Select or write in the most appropriate responses for the following items. Please do not fail to complete your name and school in the appropriate blanks at the end of the test.

1. Which of the following are problems when dealing with the learning disability concept?

   a. dealing with a poorly defined population.
   b. early recognition system lacking.
   c. methods for assessing learning potential.
   d. standardized systems of screening.
   e. shaky remedial methods.

2. The present learning disability definition formulated by the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children includes children who are developmentally disadvantaged.

   TRUE
   FALSE

3. Learning disability concepts evolved from clinicians and researchers.

   TRUE
   FALSE

4. The child with a lag in process development and the child with a specific learning disability require different types of learning experiences.

   TRUE
   FALSE

5. Which of the following are manifested behavior patterns of learning disabled children?

   a. over control of responses.
   b. hyperactivity.
   c. extreme distractibility.
   d. impulse control problems.

6. Which of the following are characteristics of the learning disabled child?

   a. difficulty distinguishing between today and tomorrow.
   b. poor eye-hand coordination.
   c. poor vision.
   d. confused by spatial relations.

7. List the four cognitive processes.

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

8. List two types of visual discrimination required to assemble a puzzle.

   a. _____

   b. _____

9. List two types of haptic discrimination required to play a game of "Simon Says."

a. _____

b. _____

10. List three limitations of informal procedures for assessing learning processes.

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

11. Which of the following is not included among the directions for filling in the "Learning Process Assessment Profile?"

a. Place a check mark under "strength" or "weakness" for each process.
b. Place checks in boxes corresponding to observed symptoms.
c. Record standardized test results in column #3.
d. Select one problem area and record under "Major Problem Area."

12. Which of the following behavioral objectives do not relate to remediation of learning process or expressive deficits?

a. When from behind him, the child is orally given 10 pairs of words, five of which begin with the same sound, he will say whether they begin with the same or different sounds with no more than one error.
b. When reading orally a page from a new story in his reading book without the aid of a marker, the child will skip or repeat a line no more than once.
c. Given orally by the teacher fifteen words each of which begin with a different consonant, the child will say the beginning sound and write the associated letter with 90% accuracy.
d. When presented with four directions from the teacher, the child will repeat all directions in the proper sequence.
e. The child will write the correct answers to 100 basic addition facts with sums up to 18 with 90% accuracy within 5 minutes without any visual or manipulative aids.

13. Which of the following commercial materials are useful in remediating a visual discrimination position in space problem?

a. Frostig Program.
b. Michigan Tracking Program.
c. DLM Pegboard and Pegboard Designs.
d. Motivator Activity Cards.

14. Which of the following commercial materials are useful in remediating a laterality-directionality problem?

a. Double-handed scissors.
b. O'Hare Starite Program.
c. Michigan Tracking Program.
d. Perceptual Development Cards.

15. Below are listed accommodations which are helpful when teaching children with learning problems. Fill in the learning process deficit for which each accommodation is appropriate.

a. use short sentences.
b. encourage gestures in discussion.
c. repeat instructions.
d. allow ample time for oral responses.

e. ask multiple choice oral questions. _____
f. provide typewriter for spelling test. _____
g. erase the chalkboard before each new task _____
h. allow child to use finger or marker in reading _____

a - auditory
v - visual
m - motor
e - vocal expression

NAME: _____

SCHOOL: _____

TEACHING POSITION: _____

DATE: _____

Instructional Model Program for All Children and Teachers

EVALUATION

TEACHER-CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FORM

Appendix K

ROOM ARRANGEMENT

Flexible ——— Conventional

Student's Work Displayed

Some ——— None

MATERIALS

Organized ——— Unorganized

Variety ——— Limited

MANAGERIAL TECHNIQUES

Positive ——— Punitive

Free Atmosphere ——— Rigid

Perceptive to Individual Needs ——— Teaches Only at Grade Level

DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

0 ——— 30

WORK INVOLVEMENT

30 ——— 0

Attending ——— Non-attending

MOVEMENT MANAGEMENT

Self-directing ——— Teacher Directed

School_____ Teacher_____

Workshop_____ Date_____

IMPACT REQUESTS 1975-76

Name: Phone: _____
Professional Title:
School Name:
School Address:

L. Request for information is used to log all requests.

AWARENESS KNOWLEDGE

ORIGIN of REQUEST	Conference Display	E & D Flier mailing	Other Media	Letter Mini Abstract Brochure	Academic Therapy Flier	Promo. Film	Phone calls

ACTION TAKEN

DECISION CONFIRMATION

ADOPTION PROCEDURES	Letter of Intent to E & D Center	Planning Session	Statement of Assurance	Commitment Criteria	On Site Training	Materials Delivered

IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION

FOLLOW UP	Demo Classrooms	Workshop Training	Impact to L. E. A.

M. *Timeline records all IMPACT dissemination activities.*

INFORMATION DISSEMINATION CHART
1975 - 1976

DATE	TOPIC	PRESENTED BY	PEOPLE IN ATTENDANCE
8/26/75	IMPACT Overview for Spec. Ed Staff P'ISD	Elaine	32
8/26/75	IMPACT Workshop Ia	Staff	33
9/8/75	Special Education Workshop for New Teachers	Staff	34
9/10/75	Meeting w/ Avondale	Staff	2
9/16/75 - 9/17	IMPACT Workshop Ib	Staff	41
9/23	Meeting w/ Birmingham people	Elaine, Dee	5
9/23	SMRTEC Workshop	Elaine, Dee, Marguerite, Mary Ann, Hazel Haukos, Kathy	30
9/29	IMPACT Workshop Session Ia & Ib Avondale Region V	Staff	23
9/30	IMPACT Workshop - II - Avondale Region V County	Staff + Nancy	41
10/1	IMPACT Workshop - Session II - County	Kathie Sue Joe Nancy	32
	" " " III - Avondale Regional	Linda Elaine	23
10/2	" " " IV " "	Staff	23
10/3	" " " V " "	Staff	23
10/8	IMPACT - Presentation for Church Group	Dee	34
10/14	IMPACT Workshop - Session II - County	Staff	11
10/15	IMPACT Workshop " " "	Staff	31
10/21	IMPACT Bus - How to use - Niles Westside Jones Mo	Sue	20
10/21	Workshop for Jr. High & Secondary Teachers Classroom Management	Todd Birmingham	37

INFORMATION DISSEMINATION CHART

DATE	TOPIC	PRESENTED BY	PEOPLE IN ATTENDANCE
10/22/75	Reading Class from WMU - IMPACT	Elaine, Sue	25
10/22/75	Learning Center & Materials - Jr. Service - Stevensville, [illegible]	Dee	12
10/28/75	IMPACT Presentation, River Valley Psych. Class	"	27
10/29/75	" " " " "	Dee	31
10/29/75	IMPACT Presentation, MAESP - Grand [illegible]	Elaine, Sue	50
11/01/75	IMPACT & LD Students - MACLD, [illegible]	Sue, Kathie	12
11/03/75	IMPACT Presentation - U.P. Education [illegible]	Elaine, Dee	45
11/12/75	IMPACT Presentation - WMU Class	Linda, Dee	45
11/19/75	LD Presentation WMU Class 635	Kathie	28
11/20/75	IMPACT Presentation Trinity Lutheran Church, Sawyer	Sue, Kathie	20
11/17/75	IMPACT Presentation - Motor Assessment - PE for Elementary Teachers - Kathy Wechler		45
11/05/75	RAID - Air Staff	Sue	12
12/03/75	IMPACT overview - Bronson	Elaine, Kathie, Sue	12
12/09/75	IMPACT MSU credit class	Staff	13
11/04/76 - 11/07	IMPACT Workshop - Session IV	Staff	40
11/20/76	'RAID' Workshop - Niles Area	Sue, Nancy	12
11/17 - 23	IMPACT Workshop for Bronson Staff	Staff	15
			427

INFORMATION DISSEMINATION CHART

DATE	TOPIC	PRESENTED BY	PEOPLE IN ATTENDANCE
1/27-28	IMPACT Workshop Session V	Staff	40
1/29/76	IMPACT News article	Herald-Palladium	1000
1/26-27	Visit from 2 staff members Project Reader, Manitowoc, Wisc.	Elaine	2
	Workshop for aides Niles	Sue, Nancy	30
2/26-27	Presentation for Title III Project Directors	Elaine, Linda	30
3/09/76	Workshop for teachers (Buchanan)	Becky	6
3/12/76	South Haven In-Service	Elaine, Dee	50
3/12/76	Coloma In Service - Learning Centers (Elementary Secondary)	Millie, Cathy Cooper	3
3/17/76	Workshop for teachers (Buchanan)	Kathie, Becky	5
3/17/76	NASCD (Miami Fla)	Linda, Sue, Dee	100
3/25/76	Psych. Class River Valley High School	Dee	30
4/20/76	IMPACT overview (Tri-County Area Staff)	Staff	10
4/26-30	IMPACT workshops Upper Peninsula Series (Dickinson, Co.)	Staff	26
5/13/76	IMPACT as tool for Mainstreaming	Elaine, Kathie, Millie Y	60
5/25/76	IMPACT overview (Detroit)	Elaine, Kathie	50
6/7-8	IMPACT overview Marquette	Elaine, Sue	30
6/10	IMPACT overview Lansing	Elaine	58
6/29	IMPACT and Reading-Learning Disabilities (Andrews University)	Elaine & Kathie	35

1575

(408)

Committment Criteria for Adoption of Project IMPACT

Project IMPACT will judge that a potential adopter is ready to receive our services when they have shown evidence of the following:

1. Needs analysis. The district must give some numerical evidence that a need for project IMPACT exists.

2. Supporting of school board and administration. The district must have authorized signatures of the Superintendent and/or a board member supporting project adoption.

3. Human resources. The district must show evidence that a well trained staff is available at their site to become the LEA Impact staff. This staff should include previous training and/or experience in learning disabilities, child growth and development, and successful classroom and/or special education teaching. The staff would consist of a minimum of one project director, two consultants, and three demonstration classroom teachers. The Impact demonstration site staff would train the LEA (Local Education Agency) staff at an on-site five day training session to be held in Berrien County. The LEA Impact staff in turn would conduct Impact teacher training workshops at the adopting school district.

4. Finances. The school district must provide funds for implementing the project locally. Factors to consider are release time for staff for the five day in-service training travel and training materials. Staff of Impact demonstration site will judge whether or not Impact has been adopted by observing evidence of inclusion of the following essential components of the Impact program.

    1. Workshop training program. The five day Impact teacher training program using the Impact teacher training kit containing the Impact Box, Impact Instructors and Teacher Manuals and six accompanying cassettes and film strips must be implemented.

    2. Demonstration classrooms. Demonstration classrooms incorporating the Impact philosophy and providing workshop participants an opportunity to visit, observe and talk with the demonstration teachers must be in operation. Evidence of the Impact "Twelve Principles of a Success Oriented Curriculum," must be observed.

    3. Teacher participants. Following the Impact teacher training workshop series, classroom teachers must have evidence of administering and completing the Impact Academic Skill and Behavior Inventories, the Learning Process Inventories, and recording information on the Academic Skill and Behavior Profiles and the Learning Process Profiles. That information will be compiled to make an individual plan for identified students following the Impact program form procedures.

    4. Consultant services. Impact LEA consultant staff visits to workshop, teacher participants should be occuring at a minimum of once monthly. And to demonstration teachers, once weekly. Consultations during and after these Impact teacher training workshop sessions have occured is a most efficient way to insure teacher change and program implementation.

Elaine Weckler
Impact Director

jmr

N. Commitment criteria used in decision making level of adoption.

AGREEMENT FOR SERVICES
between
Michigan Department of Education

O. Agreement of Service used in confirmation level of adoption.

_____, _____
(Demonstration Site) (Local Education Agency)

The following conditions are agreed to by the undersigned regarding the encumbrance of Title III funds for the adoption of IMPACT (Instructional Model Program for All Children and Teachers)

Phase I

The Demonstration Site will provide:

1. Consultants to deliver the IMPACT five day teacher training in-service following IMPACT'S system and procedures.

2. IMPACT Instructor Manuals and consumables for the five day IMPACT in-service.

3. Reimburse the LEA for 5 overnights for___ people. Meals for _____people for 5 days. Travel to Berrien County Intermediate School District.

4. Delivery of training Materials for L.E.A. to purchase for Phase II.

The LEA will:

1. Send _____teachers for the five day in-service at Berrien County Intermediate School District.

2. Provide substitutes teachers to allow LEA teachers to attend the five day IMPACT in-service.

3. Purchase materials as follows:

   1 IMPACT Box per LEA IMPACT staff @$37.50 each.

4. Payment of materials will be made in full to IMPACT upon completion of Phase I.

PHASE II

1. The Demonstration site will provide technical assistance to the LEA during project implementation during 1975-76 by 1-3 on site visits.

2. The Demonstration Site will receive data on target students to make available to Michigan Department of Education

3. The Demonstration Site will provide a training design for Phase II.

4. The Demonstration Site will provide an evaluation design for Phase II.

The LEA IMPACT STAFF

1. The LEA IMPACT staff will train _____teachers following the IMPACT system.

2. The LEA IMPACT staff will provide data on teacher/student target population.

3. The LEA agrees to purchase one IMPACT training kit. $400.00

4. The LEA agrees to purchase one IMPACT Box per every three teachers.

Payment for materials will be made in full to IMPACT after completion of Phase I

Signed_____ _____Date_____
LEA

Signed_____Date_____
Michigan Department of Education

Signed_____Date_____
Demonstration Site Director

IMPACT
Instructional Model Program for All Children and Teachers

Part I - Teacher Form

District: _____ Date: _____

Teacher's Name: _____

School Building: _____

	Yes	No
I. Classroom Organization		
A. Learning Centers		
1. Learning Centers are used in the classroom.	☐	☐
2. Different subject areas are evident at each center.	☐	☐
3. Centers are identified.	☐	☐
4. Centers contain a variety of materials.	☐	☐
5. Directions are posted in centers.	☐	☐
6. Materials in centers are well organized.	☐	☐
7. Which plan is in use:		
Dominant ☐ Transitional ☐ Supplemental ☐		
B. Room Arrangement		
1. How is the classroom arranged?		
Desks in rows ☐		
Desks in circle ☐		
Desks in groups ☐		
Other _____		
2. How are materials stored?		
Open cabinets ☐		
Closed cabinets ☐		
Shelves ☐		
Tables ☐		
Other _____		
3. Childrens work is displayed.	☐	☐
4. If learning centers are used, is there adequate space provided in each center?	☐	☐

P. *IMPACT L.E.A. teachers tally following program implementation.*

II. 12 Operating Principles		
A. Tasks are provided which are within the childrens' capabilities.	☐	☐
B. Programs are designed for children so they can succeed at least 75% of the time.	☐	☐
C. Materials and techniques are used which provide immediate feedback and reinforcement.	☐	☐
D. Children are given a choice of materials and activities within sturctured choices.	☐	☐
E. Materials are stored where they can be easily reached by teacher and students.	☐	☐
F. A wide variety of manipulative, multi-sensory materials are used.	☐	☐

		Yes	No
G.	Children have opportunities which encourage problem solving and the inquiry approach.	☐	☐
H.	Children have the opportunity for freedom of movement within socially accepted guidelines.	☐	☐
I.	Children can interact together on learning tasks.	☐	☐
J.	Equipment and materials are well cared for.	☐	☐
K.	Children are given opportunities to work independantly.	☐	☐
L.	Rules are positively stated and posted in the room.	☐	☐

IMPACT
Instructional Model Program for All Children and Teachers

Part II - Coordinator Form

School District: _____ Date: _____

Address: _____

LEA IMPACT Coordinator: _____

No. of teachers trained at IMPACT Site: _____

Student Population K - 12: _____

No. of K - 8 teachers: _____

No. of teachers trained by LEA: _____

III. Implementing Adoption

A. Workshop Training Program

1. How many of the 5 teacher-training workshops have been implemented in 1975-76?
   1 2 3 4 5

2. Please write dates of workshops held.

   #1 _____

   #2 _____

   #3 _____

   #4 _____

   #5 _____

Q. *L.E.A. IMPACT Coordinator form used to document changes following program implementation.*

	Yes	No
3. Have IMPACT manuals, boxes, filmstrips, cassettes and other materials been used in workshops?	☐	☐

B. Demonstration Classrooms

1. Demonstration classrooms incorporating the IMPACT philosophy are in operation?	☐	☐

2. List names of demonstration teachers, grade levels and building.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

	Yes	No
3. Workshop participants can visit, observe and talk with demonstration room teachers?	☐	☐
4. IMPACT's "12 Principles" are in evidence in the demonstration classrooms.	☐	☐

C. Teacher Participants

1. How many children have been programmed using the IMPACT diagnostic/prescriptive technique? ☐
2. How many teachers have administered and completed the appropriate inventories and profiles? ☐
3. How many teachers are using the IMPACT program form efficiently? ☐
4. Please attach 5 copies of completed IMPACT student programs.

D. Consultant Services

1. How many IMPACT LEA consultants are there in your district? _____
2. The LEA consultant visits workshop teacher participants at least once a month. ☐ ☐
3. The LEA consultant communicates with demonstration room teachers at least once a week. ☐ ☐

E. Will the IMPACT training program be continued in your district in 1976-77? ☐ ☐

If yes, please write a brief description of proposed plan.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____